IN THE COURT OF THE XI ADDL. CHIEF JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT :: HYDERABAD.

Wednesday, the 07th day of February, 2018.

PRESENT : Sri. S.V. Vidya Natha Reddy, M.A., LL.M.,
XI Additional Chief Judge.

O.S.NO.419 OF 2008

BETWEEN :
Mr. G. Satyaki
S/o. Late G. Seshendra Sharma
Aged 48 years, Occupation: Private Employee
32, Janata Flat
Kantishikhara Complex,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad. .... **Plaintiff**

AND

1. M/s. Neelkamal Publications Private Limited
Represented by its Managing Director
Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad – 500 095

2. Ms. Rajkumari Indiradevi Dhanrajgir
Aged 83 years, Occ: Business
R/o. Gyanbagh Palace
Goshamahal, Paanmandi
Hyderabad – 500 012. .... **Defendants**

This suit is coming on 29-01-2018 before me for final hearing in the presence of **Sri Dr. Venkat Reddy**, Advocate for the Plaintiff and Sri **T.V. Rajender,** Advocate for Defendant No.1 and Smt **Y. Padmavathi** Advocate for Defendant No.2 and this court doth order and decree as follows;-

JUDGMENT

1. Suit is filed by the plaintiff seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their employees, agents, servants etc., from using, publishing printing and passing off the copy right works titled as "My country, My people" (modern epic), Naa-desham Naa-prajulu and other related literary works written by his father Late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma and to direct the defendants to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards notional damages and for costs of the suit.

2. The averments of the plaint in brief are that, the plaintiff is the second son and last child of late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma and Smt Janaki. His father Seshendra Sharma was a famous Telugu poet and writer and his works are well identified and translated into several languages and he became famous as Guntur Seshendra Sharma and out of love and affection he assigned the copy right works in the literature created by him to the plaintiff and wrote a letter dt:02-12-1989 with his own hand to that effect. Such letter shows that all the literary works done by late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma have been transferred to the plaintiff and the plaintiff is the sole proprietor of all the literary works written by his father late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma. The plaintiffs father did not retain any rights with him and all rights have been transferred to his son the plaintiff herein. Pursuant to the letter dt:02-12-1989, plaintiff has been publishing the books written by his father late G. Seshendra Sharma. The first book was published in the month of April 1995 titled as "ENTAKAALAM ENDAMAAVULU" and in such book plaintiff published the copy of the letter dt:02-12-1989. After that the plaintiff also published eight other books titled as "SAHITYA DARSHINI", "SORABU", "SWARNA HAMMSA", "VACINDI VOTLA RUTUVU", "SHODASHI SECREATS OF RAMAYANA", "SHABDAM NUNCHI SHATABDAM VARUKU" AND "OOHALU" which contains the original works of translation of works written by his father.

3. Plaintiff's father late G. Seshendra Sharma expired on 30-05-2001 and after that the plaintiff published his father's books posthumously

beginning with a book titled NAA DESHAM – NAA PRAJALU, ADHUNIKA ITIHASA in the moth of October 2007. It is averred that Late G. Seshendra Sharma was surviving with his wife Smt Janaki and other children.

4. It is further averred that on 26-11-2007 there was a public notice issued in the newspaper, "Times of India" and "Andhra Jyothi" claiming that Smt Raja Kumari Indira Devi Dhanraj Gir as wife of Late G. Seshendra Sharma is the owner of copy right works which were transferred to her by virtue of letter dt:05-01-2006. Against such publication notice plaintiff issued reply to her counsel Doctor P.V. Vijay Kumar, Advocate vide letter dt:27-11-2007. It is further averred that on 02-06-2008 plaintiff came across the book titled as "My country, My People" (modern Epic) "NAA DESHAM NAA PRAJALU" published by Neelkamal Publication Pvt ltd., the defendant No.1 herein and such book is clear imitation of the book published by the plaintiff with the same title as NAA DESHAM, NAA PRAJALU which was published in the month of October 2007 by the plaintiff, much before the publication of the defendant No.1. It is averred that, in the plaintiff's book the Telugu version was published on the left side of the papers and English version was published on the right side of the papers in the book and the impugned copy right work published by defendant No.1 contains the same literature having English version printed on the left side of the papers of the book and the Telugu Version on the right side of the papers of the book and the contents para wise and page wise are exactly similar as to that of plaintiff's book and it is a clear violation and infringement of

copy right for which the rights are conferred on the said title with the plaintiff. It is stated that the plaintiff has not licensed any rights or what so ever to defendant No.1.

5. On 10-06-2008 plaintiff got issued legal notice to the manager of defendant No.1 company for violating the statutory rights conferred by virtue of copy right, Act 1957. For that the defendant No.1 got issued reply notice on 30-06-2008 denying the contents of notice, but admitted publication of impugned book and further submitted that defendant No.1 has entered into an agreement with defendant No.2 for the publication of the book titled as NAA DESHAM, NAA PRAJALU and ADHUNIKA MAHABHARATAM.

6. It is further averred that defendant No.2 is not the wife of plaintiff's father and she claiming rights as wife of plaintiff's father causing disturbance in the harmony of the family relations because the plaintiff's mother G. Janaki is the wife of late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma and she is still alive. That the defendant No.2 is creating false and fabricated documents. It is also averred that the father of plaintiff has high reputation and the books written by him are considered as great epics and the defendant No.2 in collusion with defendant No.1 encashing the reputation by publishing exactly similar literature for which the plaintiff has got all rights by virtue of the letter dt:02-12-1989 written by his father. That, the defendants have adopted and copied whole contents of the plaintiff's books amounts to infringement of copy right of the plaintiff in the book titled as MY COUNTRY, MY PEOPLE

(NAA DESHAM, NAA PRAJALU) by high decree conspiracy with dishonest attempt and thereby the defendants are creating confusion and litigation to pass off and falsely attempted to pass off the literature. It is stated that the conduct of the defendants is motivated to encash upon the good will and to earn easy profits on the basis of reputation upheld by the plaintiff. The plaintiff will suffer tremendous loss to his reputation and to his business if the defendant is allowed to succeed in illegal manner. Hence the suit.

7. Defendant No.1 filed written statement denying the material allegations of the plaint by contending that Late G. Seshandra Sharma during his life time married the 2nd defendant and retained his rights and also transferred the rights to the 2nd defendant by letter dated 05-01-2006 and such rights was given through a letter to the 2nd defendant dated 05-01-2006 for a period of 30 years and on the said letter issued by Late Seshandra Sharma, this defendant entered into an agreement with the 2nd defendant on 11-04-2008 under which this defendant was given right to print and publish the work of the book titled as NAA DESAM, NAA PRAJALU, AADUNIKA ITIHASAM, MY COUNTRY MY PEOPLE MODERN EPIC but, no copyright was given to this defendant, except for publishing and selling the books. The copyright was given to the 2nd defendant by her late husband during his lifetime.

8. It is denied about Late Seshandra Sharma out of his love and affection assigning his copyright works in the literature produced by him to the plaintiff under letter dated 02-12-1989 by contending that such

document is a fabricated document and even if assignment letter is true, as per copyright act, the validity of the letter is only for five years and not beyond that. It is further averred that the plaintiff did not publish the works during the lifetime of Late G. Seshandra Sharma and only after his death the plaintiff is claiming right under the alleged assignment of copyright. It is averred that the issuance of public notice by the 2nd defendant in Times of India and Andhra Jyothi on 26-11-2007 is true by stating that defendant No.2 is the wife of Late G. Seshandra Sharma who transferred his right on 05-01-2006during his lifetime in favour of defendant No.2 for a period of 30 years. It is also stated that the plaintiff's own sister has given public advertisement in the newspaper that the 2nd defendant is the wife of Late G. Seshandra Sharma and as such the allegation of the plaintiff is false. It is stated that the letter dated 02-12-1989 is brought-up document and the plaintiff has no right to publish the books of G. Seshandra Sharma. It is stated that this defendant after entering into agreement with the 2nd defendant on 11-04-2008 published the books as Late Seshandra Sharma has executed letter giving full copyrights to defendant No.2 through the letter dated 05-01-2006. Therefore this defendant is rightly publishing the books and selling them in the market.

9. It is also averred that, to the legal notice issued by the plaintiff a suitable reply was given stating that this defendant has not infringed any copyrights and he is only a publisher and seller as per agreement entered with the 2nd defendant on 11-04-2008. It is stated that the plaintiff has no right to sell the books in the market and this defendant alone is

having the right and he reserves his right to take appropriate legal action against the plaintiff towards false claim. It is averred that the plaintiff has not approached the Court with clean hands and filed the suit with malafide intentions to harass the defendants. Therefore prayed to dismiss the suit.

10. Initially defendant No.2 filed memo dated 07-11-2008 adopting the written statement filed by the 1st defendant. Subsequently defendant No.2 by approaching the Hon'ble High Court, as per orders in CRP 722 & 738 of 2011 filed her written statement on 09-11-2010. The averments of the said written statement in brief are that the claim of the plaintiff is false and the document on which the plaintiff relied upon is a false and fabricated document and the plaintiff is well aware of the fact that Late Seshandra Sharma had granted copyright in favour of defendant No.2 way back in 2002 and that many of his books and translations have been published by this defendant during the lifetime of Seshandra Sharma and that the said Seshandra Sharma has revoked all his earlier copyrights on 05-01-2006 by granting copyright of all published and unpublished works to this defendant. The plaintiff kept silent until his father passed away and filed false case to harass her.

11. It is averred that the dispute if any is with regard to assignment of copyright and not on infringement and this Court has no jurisidiction to entertain the suit because under Section-19 (A) of the Copyright Act in a case pertaining to dispute of assignment of copyright a complaint has to be filed before the Copyright Board. It is also averred that the suit is

barred by limitation in view of the fact that the plaintiff being fully aware that this defendant in 2002 itself under the copyright given by her late husband Seshandra Sharma given license to Sahitya Academy for publication of Kannada translation of Aadunika Mahabharatham and kept silent till the death of his father and using the public notice issued by this defendant is trying to overcome the limitation aspect.

12. It is further averred that even assuming, without admitting about the allegation that defendant No.2 has infringed plaintiff's copyright, the plaintiff has acquiescence by sitting silently when the defendant is presumably invading his rights and spending money on it. Such conduct of the plaintiff is inconsistent with the claim of the exclusive rights in the copyright. Therefore the plaintiff has acquiescence and abandoned his right if any to complain, as he was fully aware that his father during his lifetime had granted the copyright to this defendant and she has published many of his works both in India and Internationally through different publishers. It is also averred that, it can be inferred from inordinate delay in taking steps by the plaintiff, that the plaintiff is aware and accepted transfer of copy right by his father.

13. It is averred that defendant No.2 was married to Sri Seshandra Sharma on 16-06-1971 at Hallibeed in Karnataka and she has been promoting Telugu literature even before her marriage and has taken keen interest on all his works. Even before the grant of copy right in her favour,s she has published AUDHINIKA MAHABHARATA in the year 1985 through the Indian Languages forum, Gyanbagh Palace,

Goshamahal, Hyderabad and it was reprinted in the year 1992 and there is no whisper all through the years of any copyright to the plaintiff and the plaintiff suddenly claiming copyright in the year 1989. It is stated that the plaintiff at this belated stage came up with a fabricated document with false allegations. It is stated that the offense of infringement under the copyright Act is not attracted as this defendant is genuine and holder of legal copyright as per letter dt:05-01-2006 and as per the letter addressed to Sahithya Academy way back in 2002 and she has not violated any legal provision and she has within her rights got the books of her husband published by defendant No.1 and she is not motivated to encash the goodwill and earn easy profits as alleged by the plaintiff and infact the agreement with defendant No.1 shows that this defendant had agreed to buy back books to the tune of Rs.55,000/- which is already paid. Therefore, the defendant is not in dire requirement to earn easy profit unlike the plaintiff and her sole interest is in keeping the work of her beloved husband alive and propagating Telugu literature for the generations to come. Therefore, the plaintiff is not entitled for any reliefs and the suit is liable to be dismissed.

14. Plaintiff filed rejoinder refuting the pleadings of the written statement filed by defendant No.2. It is averred that defendant No.1 in his written statement categorically asserted that late G. Seshandra Sharma during his lifetime married defendant No.2 and retained his rights and also transferred the rights to the defendant No.2 by letter dt:05-01-2006. The same was duly confirmed by defendant No.2 by way of filing adoption memo and now defendant No.2 turned back and

changed her version saying that late Seshandra Sharma has granted the copyrights in favour of defendant No.2 way back in 2002 and the same is totally incorrect and apparently contradictory on the face of records, ridiculous and outrageous on the part of defendant No.2. it is also averred that it is fairly well settled law that even otherwise the plaintiff is legally, morally and sociologically entitled to get all the legacy rights and to succeed to all the properties either movable or immovable, tangible or intangible and visible or invisible along with all his intellectual property rights including the copyrights over the literature works of his father as a successor. It is stated that except the plaintiff none else have any prevailing or privileged rights than the plaintiff over the copyrights of his father late Seshandra Sharma. Therefore the objection raised by defendant No.2 in her additional written statement are unsustainable and other averments of the said additional written statement are all false and incorrect. That the plaintiff filed the suit to enforce his statutory right over the copyrights which were duly transferred by his father by way of written instrument dt:02-12-1989 and he never concealed any material facts as alleged by the defendant No.2 and all the assertions and allegations made by defendant No.2 are false, incorrect and invented for the purpose of unscrupulous litigations.

15. It is also averred that defendant No.2 though claimed as a true copyright holder, she has not bonafidely came forward to the Hon'ble Court by raising any counter claim and has not shown any proper explanation to show the circumstances which prevented her from claiming the alleged rights over the subject copyrights by way of either

counter claim or by way of filing separate suit for her rights. It is further stated that the rights conferred by his father over the subject copyright are unlimited without there being any time frame and the publication of the books is completely within his own domain and it is his prerogative right whether to publish or not to publish the books and when to publish which is completely within the preview of his desire and nobody can compel him to do or not to do and there is no specific stipulation indicating him to publish the books in the first twelve months from the date of transferring the copyrights by his father in his favour. Therefore, prayed the court to decree the suit as prayed for.

16. *On the above rival pleadings the following issues are settled for trial?*

i) Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for?

ii) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to direct the defendants to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards notional damages which is claimed for the damages and loss of income as also the loss of reputation owing to the unethical acts of defendants?

iii) To what relief?

17. The plaintiff to prove his case testified himself as P.W.1 and examined the assistant director, T.S.F.S.L. as C.W.1 and got marked his documents as Ex.A-1 to A-12 and Ex.X-1.

18. On the other hand on behalf of the defendants defendant No.1 testified himself as D.W.1 and defendant No.2 testified herself as D.W.2 and their documents are marked Ex.B-1 to B-12.

19. Heard arguments from the learned counsel on both sides.

20. The learned counsel for petitioner argued that admittedly the plaintiff is the son of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma. and Smt G. Janaki and his father during his life time assigned the copyrights works in the literature created by him in favour fo the plaintiff through the written letter dt:02-12-1989 under Ex.A-2 and thereby the plaintiff became the sole proprietor of all the literary works written by his father late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma. He further submitted that pursuant to such letter of assignment under Ex.A-2 plaintiff has been publishing the books written by his father and the first book was published in the month of April 1995 with a title ENTHAKAALAM, ENDAMAAVULU and in such book he published the letter Ex.A-2 also and after that published several books written by his father and his father late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma expired on 30-05-2001. He further contends that the defendant No.2 by creating false and fabricated documents after the death of Sri G. Seshandra Sharma issued a public notice in the newspapers on 26-11-2007 claiming herself as the owner of copyright works of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma by virtue of a letter dt:05-01-2006 and against such publication plaintiff got issued reply to the counsel of defendant No.2 Dr. P.V. Vijay Kumar Advocate. He also argued that the wife of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma, Smt G. Janaki is alive and her marriage with

late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma is still subsisting and the defendant No.2 by falsely claiming as the wife of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma is trying to encash the reputation of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma on the basis of false and fabricated documents and defendant No.2 in collusion with defendant No.1 fabricated documents and publishing exactly similar literature on which the plaintiff got all rights by virtue of the letter dt:02-12-1989 as Ex.A-2. Therefore, the defendants are liable to be injuncted from using, publishing or printing the works titled as MY COUNTRY, MY PEOPLE, NAA DESHAM NAA PRAJALU and other related literary works written by late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma.

21. The learned counsel for defendant No.2 argued that the father of plaintiff married defendant No.2 in the year 1971 with the consent of his first wife and since then stayed with defendant No.2 and did his literary works through defendant No.2 and transferred the copyrights on all his literary works in favour of defendant No.2 through Ex.B-3 for a period of 30 years in the year 2006 and through Ex.B-3 all the previous transfers were cancelled by revocation and thereby defendant No.2 acquired copyrights on the literary works of deceased Sri G. Seshandra Sharma.

22. It is also argued that the paper publication under Ex.B-8 issued by one of the siblings of the plaintiff (sister) by declaring that defendant No.2 as the legal wife of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma and a heir to the literary works of the said late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma. It is further argued that Under Section 19-A plaintiff should approach Copyright Board. Further stated that if at all plaintiff was given any assignment

then his father late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma must have addressed a letter to the Sahitya Academy and that the plaintiff should have exercised his rights under such assignment within five years from the date of such assignment and as per Section 19(4) and 19(5) the claim of the plaintiff is barred by limitation. It is also argued that the alleged letter under Ex.A-2 was written in the year 1989 and such rights conferred under Ex.A-2 will die its natural death after 12 years. Therefore, the plaintiff cannot claim any right under Ex.A-2. It is further contended that father of plaintiff Sharma exercised his right in the year 1993 and addressed a letter to Sahitya Academy, but the plaintiff has not objected for it and therefore the plaintiff is estopped by his acquiescence. Therefore the plaintiff is not entitled for injunction as prayed for.

23.ISSUE NO.1:-

i) Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for?

24. It is an admitted fact that the plaintiff is the son of late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma and Smt G. Jananki and that the said Sri G. Seshandra Sharma is a writer and poet and the literary works pertaining to this case were produced by him and he expired on 30-05-2007. The death certificate issued by M.C.H. was filed by the plaintiff and marked as Ex.A-3.

25. Plaintiff claims copyright over the literary works written by late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma under the letter marked as Ex.A-2 and when

the same was confronted with D.W.2 (D-2) during her cross examination she categorically admitted at the last para in Page No.3 of her cross examination that the said letter is in the handwriting of Sri G. Seshandra Sharma and further stated that she does not know whether Sri G. Seshandra Sharma writes letters on his letter heads or not. Thus, Ex.A-2 is confirmed by defendant No.2 herself in her cross examination. Ex.A-2 dt:02-12-1989 shows that Sri G. Seshandra Sharma transferred all the copyrights on all the books written by him as a poet and author in Telugu together with their translations in favour of his son G. Satyaki, plaintiff herein and further says that such transfer comes into effect forthwith from 02-12-1989.

26. The contension of the defendant is that as per provision U/s.9(4) and 19(5) of Copyright Act plaintiff failed to exercise his rights within five years from the date of Ex.A-2 and thereby he is acquiesced of such right in favour of defendant No.2. But it is clear from Section 19(7) of Copyright Act 1957 that the Sub Sections 2 to 6 of Section 19 are not applicable to the assignments made before coming into force of the Copyright (amendment) Act 1994. The said Amendment Act i.e., 38 of 1994 came into force with effect from 10-05-1995. Since the assignment under Ex.A-2 was made on 02-12-1989 prior to the Copyright Amendment Act 1994, the provisions under Sub Sections 4 & 5 of Section 19 of Copyright Act are not applicable to Ex.A-2.

27. Evidence of P.W.1 shows that he published the book written by his father marked as A-11 during the lifetime of his father. Ex.A-11 tittled as

ENTHAKAALAM- E- ENDAMAAVULU shows that it was published for the first time in the month of April 1995 and it contains the plaintiff's name as the holder of rights. This shows that the plaintiff by publishing the books written by his father exercised his rights even during the lifetime of his father.

28. Defendants are relying upon Ex.B-3 purported to be executed by Sri Guntur Seshander Sharma on 05-01-2006, the contents of which shows that the said Sri G. Seshandra Sharma transferred the copyrights of all his literary works both published and unpublished including their transfer to his wife Raja kumari Indira Devi Dhanrajgir. Plaintiff contends that the said document Ex.B-3 was a forged and fabricated document and got it referred to Telengana State Forensic Laboratory and the said laboratory issued its report Ex.X-1 stating that the signature on Ex.X-1 was printed through a printing process and it was not executed with any writing instrument. The said report Ex.X-1 was proved by the plaintiff by examining the Assistant Director, Telengana State Forensic Science Laboratory as C.W.1. Thus the evidence of C.W.1 and the report Ex.X-1 shows that Ex.B-3 was not signed by Late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma and his signature on Ex.B-3 was printed through a printing process. Cross examination of C.W.1 shows that Ex.A-2 was written with a writing instrument (pen) and he examined Ex.B-3 by comparing it with Ex.A-2. The handwritings in Ex.A-2 are admitted by defendant No.2 herself in her cross examination as that of Late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence of C.W.1 and Ex.X-1, it is held that Ex.B-3 was not executed by Late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma.

Therefore defendant No.2 cannot claim any copyrights on the literary works of Late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma.

29. Defendant No.2 testified himself as D.W.2 but she did not choose to examine any other witness to prove that Ex.B-3 was executed by Sri G. Seshandra Sharma. Defendant No.1 deposed as D.W.1 is not a witness to Ex.B-3 and is not competent to prove Ex.B-3.

30. Plaintiff being the son of Late Sri G. Seshandra Sharma and acquiring the copyright from his father through Ex.A-2 is entitled to protect his copyrights over the literary works of his father. Hence he is entitled for perpetual injunction as prayed for.

<u>31.ISSUE NO.2:-</u>

ii) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to direct the defendants to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards notional damages which is claimed for the damages and loss of income as also the loss of reputation owing to the unethical acts of defendants?

32. Though the plaintiff pleaded in his plaint and also reproduced all the pleadings of the plaint in his chief examination affidavit stating that the conduct of the defendants is motivated to encash upon his good will and earn easy profits on the basis of reputation upheld by him and prayed to direct the defendants to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards notional damages which is claimed for the damages and loss of income and also towards the loss of reputation owing to the unethical acts of

defendants, no evidence was brought on record by the plaintiff to prove the said allegations in order to establish that he is entitled to claim such amount towards damages from the defendants. Therefore, I am of the considered opinion that the plaintiff failed to establish that the defendants are liable to pay any amount to him towards damages or loss of income as claimed by him. Hence this issue is answered accordingly against the plaintiff.

33.ISSUE NO.3:-

iii) To what relief?

34. ***IN THE RESULT,*** suit is decreed partly by granting permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their employees, agents, servants etc., from using, publishing printing and passing off the copy right works titled as "My country, My people" (modern epic), Naa-desham Naa-prajulu and other related literary works written by his father Late Sri G. Seshendra Sharma together with proportionate costs and the claim for damages of Rs.50,000/- is dismissed.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 07th day of February, 2018).

XI ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT:HYDERABAD.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
Witnesses Examined for

Plaintiff
P.W.1:G. Satyaki

C.W.1: V. Muralidhar

Defendant
D.W.1:Sureshchandra Sharma
D.W.2: Rajkumari Indira Devi

Documents marked for Plaintiff

Ex.A-1 are two bills for purchase of books dated:02-06-2008 and 03-08-2008.

Ex.A-2 is authorisation letter of copy rights of all books dated is the 02-12-1989.

Ex.A-3 is death certificate of late G. Seshendra Sharma dated:04-06-07.

Ex.A-4 is family members certificate dated:31-12-2007 issued by Tahsildar, Khairtabad Mandal.

Ex.A-5 is office copy of letter dated:27-11-2007 addressed by me to Dr P.B. Vijay kumar, Advocate along with postal receipt.

Ex.A-6 is legal notice dated:10-06-2008 addressed to D.No.1.

Ex.A-7 is reply notice got issued by Defendant No.1 dated:03-06-08

Ex.A-8 is book "Na Desham-Na Prajulu, My Country-My People."

Ex.A-9 is another book "My Country-My people – Na Desham-Na Prajulu"

Ex.A-10 is book "Ruthu Ghosha – Mande Suryudu".

Ex.A-11 is book "Seshendra – Antha Kalam Ee Endamarulu".

Ex.A-12 is book "Letters of Seshendra in defence of people and poetry".

Documents marked for (C.W.1)

Ex.X-1 is the opinion of C.W.1.

Defendants:-

Ex.B-1 Extract of Article in Sahitya Akademy Bimonthly Journal.

Ex-B-2 Extract os article in Ruthu Ghosha – Telugu Poetry.

Ex.B-3 Extract of Article in Sahitya Kaumudhi – Essays in Telugu

Ex.B-4 True copy of paper publication in the times of India, Hyderabad, dt-:26-11-2007.

Ex.B-5 True copy- of paper publication in the times of India, Hyderabad,- dt-:04-12-2007.

Ex.B-6 Transfer copy right dated:05-01-2006.

Ex.B-7 Office Copy of letter, dt:14-08-2002 Sahity Akademy.

Ex.B-8 Office copy of license, Dated:14-08-2002.

Ex.B-9 to B-11 Books

Ex.B-12 License for publication.

XI ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT:HYDERABAD.

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY
SUPERINTENDENT
CENTRAL COPYING ESST.
CITY CIVIL COURT. HYDERABAD. T.S

COURT OF THE CHIEF JUDGE
CITY CIVIL COURT HYDERABAD
CENTRAL COPYIST ESTABLISHMENT

C.A. No. 3865/18

Application made on 12/2/18

Stamps Called on 16/4/18

Charges Stamps Deposited on 19/4/18

Charges 85/-

Charges a Sum of Rs.

Deposited U/R 203 (3) (1) U/r No. 7443

Addl. Stamps Called on —

Addl. Stamps Deposited on —

Copy made ready on 20/4/18

Copy Delivered on 20/4/18

SUPERINTENDENT
Central Copyist Establishment
City Civil Court, Hyderabad

20/4/18